



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to favor the retention of some features of an establishment; in 1784 they favored a general assessment for the support of religion, but they withdrew from this position the next year, and in general were friends of liberty. The Methodists, who had as yet hardly separated formally from the Church of England, took no definite part in the contest. The Baptists were in the best position, by their history and their beliefs, to oppose all restrictions of the exercise of religion: they were the most radical of dissenters, and they had never had, as a body, any connection with the state. At the outset of the war they warmly espoused the side of the colonies, and thus found themselves in position to secure an extension of privileges; their petition to the Convention of 1775, that their ministers should be allowed to preach to their soldiers in camp, was granted. There has been a good deal of controversy on the question whether the Baptists or the Presbyterians took the lead in the demand for religious liberty in Virginia; the facts in the case are presented at length and in a spirit of fairness in this volume. It is asserted by Baptist historians that as early as 1775 the Baptists resolved to petition the convention for the abolition of the ecclesiastical establishment; but it does not appear that the petition was ever sent up. On this and similar points, such as the revision of the marriage-laws and the abolition of glebes, Dr. James is full and precise, and his volume will be found useful by all students of history.

C. H. TOY.

The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780. By EDWARD MCCRADY, LL.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. 899.)

THE volume of Mr. McCrady's narrative broadens and strengthens as he progresses. This, the third installment of his work, fully justifies its claim to the leading position among our state histories. More than 850 pages are here devoted to the history of the Revolution in South Carolina from its beginning to the close of 1780. Another volume will be required to trace the history of the Revolution to its close. If he continues on this scale through the first half of the nineteenth century, he will have produced one of the most elaborate of existing treatises on American history. When this and other works on South Carolina already in preparation shall be completed and published, we may suppose that the political history of that commonwealth will have been more thoroughly explored than that of any other.

As in the period of royal government, so here Mr. McCrady finds no competitor of importance of later date than Ramsay's *Revolution in South Carolina*. The *Memoirs* of Drayton, Moultrie, Lee, Tarleton; Draper's elaborate study of the battle of King's Mountain, and the biographies of the commanders engaged in the conflict illustrate each its phase of the subject. But none of these is more than a special study or a contribution of original material. These, with other studies like them, are the sources

from which the author has drawn his facts, while in many parts he has added material from his own inquiries. This by criticism and comparison he has framed into a consistent whole. He presents a clear and reasonable view of the progress of the Revolution in South Carolina, one which is supported by the large array of facts which he cites. Very little help seems to have been derived from unprinted sources, while of those in print the memoirs of Drayton and the monograph of Draper have been used most extensively. It is true that, as the author states, he has followed Draper very closely in his account of all which concerns King's Mountain.

This volume, like the subject to which it is devoted, falls naturally into two parts. It is concerned first with the origin and development of the Revolution in the low country, the coast district of the province, among the merchants, planters and political leaders of that region. This preliminary act in the drama closed with the surrender of Charleston early in 1780. Then, owing to the mistaken policy of the British commanders, Clinton and Cornwallis, tragedy began in earnest with action in bewildering variety and succession, the rising of the upper counties with the partisan warfare which desolated them till the close of the struggle. This was the real Revolution in South Carolina.

The work is thorough, sane and well balanced throughout. The distinguishing feature of the first part is the clearness with which the author shows that by the great majority of the people even of the low country, not independence, but only a redress of grievances was consciously sought; and that their grievances were different in character from those of Massachusetts and far inferior in degree. A study of the characters of William Henry Drayton and Christopher Gadsden is given, which shows how remote their ideals were from those of the majority of their fellow-citizens but yet how by energy and address they seized control of the political machinery of the province and ran it in the interest of the Revolutionary cause. They were enabled to do this because of the concentration of political power in the lower counties. Still when in February, 1776, Gadsden, in the provincial congress declared himself in favor of independence, his utterance was received with astonishment and abhorrence. John Rutledge, the most trusted among the political leaders in Charleston, did not abandon the hope of reconciliation till the progress of the war in 1778 compelled him so to do. The reasons for the failure of the leaders of the coast to commit the up-country to the Revolution are made clear. The influence of action by the other colonies at Philadelphia and elsewhere and that of personal leadership and party conflicts in the state itself are noted. A critical, essentially a moderate loyalist attitude is maintained by the author in his discussion of the entire subject. His conclusion is—not unlike that of Ramsay's—"that the people of South Carolina without any original design on their part were step by step drawn into the revolution and war, which involved them in every species of difficulty and finally dis severed them from the mother country."

The leading feature of the second part of the volume is the fullness of detail with which the partizan warfare of 1780 in the upper counties is described. By no other writer has this part of the subject been treated with such minuteness. The outbreak of this conflict was due to the issue of orders by the British, after the state had been practically conquered, which compelled all to choose between imprisonment and active service on the side of the King. This effort artificially to stimulate loyalism, taken in connection with the brutality and greed of the English soldiery, forced the entire northern part of the state into insurrection. By the unaided efforts of the people, under leaders many of whom had no commissions, the progress of the British was checked, and the effects of the American defeat at Camden largely overcome. This proved the turning point of the war in the south, if not throughout the continent, and at least saved the South from ultimate submission to England. This explains the reason for the emphasis laid by the author on this phase of the subject, and for what he declares will be his continued insistence upon it when, in his next volume, he undertakes to describe the campaign of Greene.

With the above is connected a theory, elaborated in Chapter XIV. and elsewhere, to the effect that Washington, and the leaders of the Revolution in its early stages in South Carolina, were wrong in insisting that the chief dependence should be placed on a regular army, raised, paid and organized after the European model. This form of military force, the writer believes, was not suited to American conditions, and has been to a large extent abandoned by the United States in its later wars. What was needed instead was "an organization in which men of the highest character may serve in the ranks from patriotism, regardless of pay; an organization which, formed by enlistment for definite periods—sometimes for a whole war—combines the permanence of a regular force with the superior zeal and character of the patriot." South Carolina, in the opinion of the author, affords a vivid illustration of what may be accomplished by spontaneous popular effort. But it may be suggested that Washington's system made ample provision for the voluntary service of patriots, if they would only enlist in sufficient numbers and for sufficiently long periods of time. The fact is, a people cannot be depended on to do what was accomplished in South Carolina, or in Prussia during the War of Liberation, except under extraordinary pressure, when their homes and lives are actually imperilled. No sweeping conclusions can be drawn from such exceptional conditions. Other provision must be made for the continuous work of defense.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

Loyalism in New York During the American Revolution. By ALEXANDER CLARENCE FLICK, PH.D. (New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. 282.)

THE appearance of an unprejudiced and scientifically constructed work upon the subject of the Tory in the American Revolution is gratifying